

R E M A R K S

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner for her courtesy in granting the interview held on January 19, 2006, the prior amendment having been discussed at the interview.

Base claim 1 now further emphasizes the following:

c) a packed catalyst located within said outer region, and through which reformat gases flow, all of said catalyst extending only helically and everywhere about the steam generator, there being flow guide surfaces extending helically adjacent the catalyst between said inner and outer cylindrical surfaces to which said guide surfaces are connected, to direct all gases to flow only helically through the padded catalyst between said inner and outer wall surfaces, said catalyst being separate from the flow guide surfaces, the catalyst located entirely outside and outwardly of the generator, said catalyst being continuous in the helical direction of guided flow about the steam generator located centrally in the reactor.

Structural distinctions over Steiner include:

- i) a packed catalyst in a volume as defined, the volume between the inner and outer wall surfaces filled with the packed catalyst,
- ii) there are flow guide surfaces extending helically adjacent the catalyst, between inner and outer wall surfaces, of an outer region about the steam generator, and to which wall surfaces the flow guide surfaces are connected (see text at page 20),
- iii) all gases are directed to flow only helically through the helical packed catalyst and between the inner and outer wall surfaces, and about the generator the catalyst being everywhere separate from the flow guide surfaces,
- iv) the catalyst everywhere extending about the steam generator.

Steiner lacks suggestion of i) since he has no packed catalyst in a volume, as defined. He relies on a "turbulator" as at 24, or 224 consisting itself of catalyst material.

He has no packed catalyst separate from his flow quiding turbulator. Steiner lacks ii) because he has no flow guide surfaces separate from his catalyst, and his catalyst is not in a packed volume. Steiner lacks iii) because his gases do not flow through his catalyst, but rather flow adjacent the outer surface of his catalyst on his turbulator. He has no packed volume about a steam generator and through which volume gases can flow. Also there is no motivation to reconstruct Steiner in view of Muenger or Collins to meet the above limitations, considering Steiner's "turbulator" and open space teachings. Steiner does not suggest iv) because his steam generator extends about the catalyst, i.e. his catalyst does not everywhere extend about his steam generator as recited in iv) above and in c) of claim 1. Steiner's methanation tubes extend through his steam generator 506 (col. 4, lines 67-68).

Claim 3 clearly recites the catalyst composition. The heat transfer fins of claim 6 projecting into the catalyst from the inner wall, are not suggested by Steiner, or other cited art. Steiner does not teach fins projecting into his catalyst turbulator metal.

Serial No. 09/709,616

Accordingly, base claim 1 and all dependent claims are believed and urged to define unobvious structures, functions and results and to be allowable.

Dorschner, Muenger and Collins are believed and urged not to be more pertinent than Steiner, as respects points argued above, and at the interview. All dependent claims are urged to be allowable in the novel and unobvious environment of claim 1, as amended.

Allowance is respectfully solicited. A telephone call to Counsel is invited to clarify any further matter. Examiner indicated at the interview that this amendment would be considered by Examiner, along with the primary Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,



William W. Haefliger
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 17,120
(323) 684-2707

WWH:ts
Docket 12,150